2017 ZONING WARRANT ARTICLES

ARTICLE 36: Amendment 1 - Elderly Housing

Are you in favor of adopting Amendment No. 1 as proposed by the Planning Board as follows:

To **amend** Section 4.20 of the Zoning Ordinance to clarify that density in an elderly housing development shall be determined using the base density and bonus densities as described in Section 4.16 – Integrated Innovative Housing Ordinance (IIHO).

(The Planning Board voted 7-0-0 to support this article)

This article clarifies the previous intent of the Planning Board that Section 4.16 of the zoning ordinance shall be the sole method of determining density in an Elderly Housing development by specifically referring back to that section of the ordinance.

What does this mean?

A "yes" vote on this article means that if you wish to build an Elderly Housing development, you will be explicitly directed to Section 4.16 to determine allowable density of the development.

A "no" vote means that you do not want to clarify this provision of the ordinance.

ARTICLE 37: Amendment 2 – Corrections of formatting errors and for consistency with 2016 Amendments

Are you in favor of adopting Amendment No. 2 as proposed by the Planning Board as follows:

Amend Section 4.16.B.3 & Section 4.16.E to update for consistency with 2016 Zoning Amendments.

(Planning Board recommends approval of this amendment 7-0)

This amendment makes the newly adopted Section 4.16 – IIHO consistent with terms used elsewhere in the ordinance. It includes several wording changes and updated section references to be consistent with Zoning Amendments adopted in 2016. These are non-substantive changes.

What does this mean?

A "yes" vote on this article means that if you want to correct the clerical errors in the ordinance.

A "no" vote means that you do not want to correct the clerical errors in the ordinance.

ARTICLE 38: Amendment 3 – Accessory Apartments

Are you in favor of adopting Amendment No. 3 as proposed by the Planning Board as follows:

Amend Section 9.1, Definitions by **changing** the allowable area for an accessory apartment to 1,100 Square Feet and changing the allowable number of bedrooms to up to two.

(Planning Board recommends this amendment by a vote of 7-0)

Currently, accessory apartments are allowed in the Rural Residential, Northern Rural, Northern Transitional, Commercial and Limited Commercial Zones. The proposed amendment would modify the definition of "accessory apartment" to be consistent with state law, and increases the allowable size of an accessory apartment.

What does this mean?

A "yes" vote on this article means that you want to make the zoning ordinance consistent with the requirements of state law.

A "no" vote means that you do not want to change the ordinance. The ordinance would then remain in conflict with state requirements.

ARTICLE 39: Amendment 4 - Corrections of additional formatting errors and for consistency with 2016 Amendments

Are you in favor of adopting Amendment No. 4 as proposed by the Planning Board as follows:

Amend Section 4.14.I to change "shall" to "may," and **Amend** Section 4.17.B to add "<u>and Section 4.16 – IIHO</u>" after "Subdivision Regulations."

(Planning Board recommends this amendment by a vote of 7-0)

Several wording changes need to be made for consistency with Zoning Amendments adopted in 2016. These are non-substantive changes.

What does this mean?

Currently, in Section 4.14.I the ordinance includes the word "shall" requiring the inclusion of multifamily buildings in workforce housing projects. A "yes" vote on this article means that you want to change this to "may," and allow the inclusion of multi-family buildings without requiring them.

Currently, Section 4.17 – Planned Residential Development does not reference Section 4.16 – IIHO. A "yes" vote on this article means that you want to change the Ordinance to refer to the IIHO section of the ordinance in the Planned Residential Development provisions as originally intended.

A "no" vote means that you do not want to change the ordinance.